

Date: Tue, 21 Sep 93 04:30:17 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #343
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 21 Sep 93 Volume 93 : Issue 343

Today's Topics:

 Codeless Technician
 Lost my license (2 msgs)
 Neighborhood watch groups (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 21 Sep 1993 09:19:14 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Codeless Technician
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dbushong@wang.com (Dave Bushong) writes:

>Rick Aldom <ayka60@email.sps.mot.com> writes:

>

>>In article <!--jzhvg@dixie.com> John De Armond, jgd@dixie.com writes:

>

>> I guess the faux snobbery of many CW operators is the thing that bugs
>>me the most about CW.

>

>> I know that John tends to stir up the r.r.a.misc board, but maybe some
>>of the more snobbish hams should take note.....Just because your took
>>the time to learn CW doesn't make you any better or worse than anyone
>>else.

>

>How do you know that?

Probably the same way you think you know otherwise.

>I guess if people who weren't proficient in CW were confined to
>certain bands that wouldn't interfere with my enjoyment of the CW part
>of the hobby, then I wouldn't mind. But saying that anywhere is OK to

Couple of things. This sounds a lot like NIMBY. It also has little to
nothing to do with the discussion as I haven't seen anyone propose changing
the band plans. So CW ops would still enjoy their exclusive pieces of
spectrum.

>Is this the same kind of thing? I'm not forcing anyone to learn code,
>but if I'm trying to use CW to make a contact, I would really have a
>problem with a wide-band signal interfering with enjoyment of the
>hobby, just because someone didn't want to learn code.

Again, where was the proposal to change the band plans?

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: 19 Sep 1993 12:27:17 GMT
From: swrinde!sdd.hp.com!saimiri.primate.wisc.edu!doug.cae.wisc.edu!zazen!
news.uwsuper.edu!hp.uwsuper.edu!pmcgilla@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Lost my license
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Hi,
Well after looking and looking I can't seem to find it. Should I apply
for a copy or just walk in and take the general test from scratch. Oh,
by the way I lost my novice.

--
Patrick L. McGillan
Computer Systems Specialist
University Of Wisconsin Ph: (715) 394-8191
Superior, Wisconsin pmcgilla@uwsuper.edu

Date: Mon, 20 Sep 93 15:07:59 GMT
From: walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Lost my license
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <27hj75INNfqc@news.uwsuper.edu> pmcgilla@hp.uwsuper.edu (Mr. Patrick L. McGillan) writes:

>Hi,

> Well after looking and looking I can't seem to find it. Should I apply
>for a copy or just walk in and take the general test from scratch. Oh,
>by the way I lost my novice.

>Patrick L. McGillan

> pmcgilla@uwsuper.edu

If you mean you want to take the tech and general theory and the 13 wpm and be issued a CSCE only, that's fine, but you'll still need to get a re-issued novice license to validate your existing call sign and the novice theory credit.

After receiving your "duplicate"

Novice license, you can then have bring it to a VE test session with the other CSCE's indicating element credit for the upgrade and have it submitted.

If you intend to retake the novice, tech and general theory and then the 13wpm CW, to apply for the General license without providing a copy of your Novice license to prove element credit, that's an interesting situation. It would logically seem OK, but the 610 asks for your current license status and I believe the 610 appears to presume that an already licensed person will be providing a copy of their existing license to be filled with the upgrade. As I recall, there is no way to indicate that for the upgrade, the applicant retook the novice theory because he didn't have a copy of his license.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

Date: 20 Sep 93 23:17:51 GMT
From: mulvey!root@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Neighborhood watch groups
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

John R. Moore (john@anasazi.com) wrote:

: nu7i@indirect.com (Darrell Shandrow) writes:

: >The neighborhood watch is a great application of amateur radio. I don't
: >think that it is necessary to get permission from a repeater group before

: >using it on such an event. This is even if that repeater is the local
: >chat box. We must remember that amateur radio is a service first and a
: >chat box secondly or maybe even chatting should be as low as the third or
: >least important levels.

: As an owner of repeaters (ie, part owner of Northlink), I strongly
: disagree. ANYTIME you plan to regularly use a repeater for a net,
: you should ask permission of the owner.

: If a block watch group showed up on Northlink regularly, we would ask
: them to leave (or system is statewide). If a block watch group shows up
: on ANY repeater, they are likely to be asked to leave. The repeater wasn't
: set up for block watch. If you ask the owner AHEAD of time, he might
: agree, if it isn't incompatible with the intended use of the repeater.

: And before you flame me about the public service aspect of ham radio,
: let me remind you that there are MANY different aspects of ham radio,
: and some repeaters may exist for a very specific function (such as
: DX spotting). Furthermore, other public service/safety functions that
: you don't even know about may be going on. For example, one Northlink
: repeater was put in specifically at the request of the National Weather
: Service for skywarn. If we have a big storm going, we don't want a bunch
: of neighborhood watchers on their reporting that everything is normal!

: A repeater belongs to someone. If you want to use it for YOUR group,
: on a regular bases, ASK. It's only common courtesy.

: >I participate in a walk with my blindness organization and we don't seek
: >permission since we don't know really whether or not we'll need the use of
: >a repeater. Of course, I probably wouldn't break into a busy repeater but
: >I figure anyone who wouldn't want us to do a public service event with
: >their repeater better have a legitimate service-related reason. 73 for
: >now.

: You really don't understand private property rights, apparently.

: --

: DISCLAIMER: These views are mine alone, and do not reflect my employer's!
: John Moore 7525 Clearwater Pkwy, Scottsdale, AZ 85253 USA (602-951-9326)
: john@anasazi.com Amateur call:NJ7E Civil Air Patrol:Thunderbird 381
: - - Support ALL ...erk glugh mmpph.... Memory fault (core dumped)

Date: Mon, 20 Sep 93 18:07:13 GMT
From: mercury.hsi.com!a3bee2.radnet.com!cyphyn!randy@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Neighborhood watch groups
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

john@anasazi.com (John R. Moore) writes:

:
: As an owner of repeaters (ie, part owner of Northlink), I strongly
: disagree. ANYTIME you plan to regularly use a repeater for a net,
: you should ask permission of the owner.
:
: If a block watch group showed up on Northlink regularly, we would ask
: them to leave (or system is statewide). If a block watch group shows up
: on ANY repeater, they are likely to be asked to leave. The repeater wasn't
: set up for block watch. If you ask the owner AHEAD of time, he might
: agree, if it isn't incompatible with the intended use of the repeater.
:
: And before you flame me about the public service aspect of ham radio,
: let me remind you that there are MANY different aspects of ham radio,
: and some repeaters may exist for a very specific function (such as
: DX spotting). Furthermore, other public service/safety functions that
: you don't even know about may be going on. For example, one Northlink
: repeater was put in specifically at the request of the National Weather
: Service for skywarn. If we have a big storm going, we don't want a bunch
: of neighborhood watchers on their reporting that everything is normal!
:
: A repeater belongs to someone. If you want to use it for YOUR group,
: on a regular bases, ASK. It's only common courtesy.
:
:
: You really don't understand private property rights, apparently.
:
: --

I've seen where, repeater bunches very much do not want others on that are not saying what they want to hear (In essence, thats all it is), and take measures to insure it.

Well! It's quite clear that repeaters are to be avoided at all costs, for any form of use except what the private ownership wants to hear coming thru their private repeater.--on thier private frequency (The end result!)

I think it's time we have 2 mters /220/440 etc returned back to all simplex, Then, there won't be these all-day-long-unused-freqs (don't dare use), and there won't be any more problems about who uses which freq for what use.

It's disgusting that some private bunch ties up a freq for some seldom used function, and takes measures to prevent others from using that freq.

NOW I see why people operate simplex on the inputs of repeaters!

===

But...thats another topic, probably still going on in ...policy

I still (for other reasons besides) think, that the watch group will have better results using simplex; 1 to 4 freqs, and organise passing of info, where ever needed (via air - via phone line - whatever) and rely only on themselves and equipment in hand.
Then they won't suddenly get stranded.

Sence this is a small group (covering -- it looks like -- 1/2 sq mi.) then it won't need to be as elaborate as I first suggested.
(I thought it was going to involve...oh say 1/2 of town, like they did where I used to live)

By all means set up the watch group, but STAY AWAY from those repeaters!
They are nothing but trouble.

--
Randy KA1UNW If you get a shock while
 servicing your equipment, "Works for me!"
randy@192.153.4.200 DON'T JUMP! -Peter Keyes
 You might break an expensive tube!

Date: Mon, 20 Sep 93 13:42:33 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!lkollar@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Sep14.185007.21606@cyphyn.radnet.com>,
<1993Sep18.071614.9294@indirect.com>, <john.748365714@misty>
Subject : Re: Neighborhood watch groups

This is probably a tempest in a teapot... it should be no problem to find a friendly repeater. F'r example, a friend of mine has a repeater set up on a Forest Service tower in north Georgia and justifies it by saying it's for emergency/public service use. I haven't asked him, but I'd bet he'd welcome a neighborhood watch group for that very reason. (The repeater also hosts a weekly county ARES net, but that's another topic.)

Anyway...

john@anasazi.com (John R. Moore) writes:

>A repeater belongs to someone. If you want to use it for YOUR group,
>on a regular bases, ASK. It's only common courtesy.

This I strongly agree with. Although I munched the relevant text, I also agree that Northlink (& other linked repeater groups) are not the place for local/neighborhood exercises. However, if you're a repeater owner and do not want a public service group on your machine, it's only common courtesy (dare I say "obligation"?) to help that group find a more suitable (or more accommodating) repeater.

--

Larry Kollar, KC4WZK | I like CW, but that doesn't mean I think every ham
lkollar@nyx.cs.du.edu | should have to learn it.

"You mean you came back from the dead, to tell me I'm *odd*?"

Date: Mon, 20 Sep 1993 14:11:09 GMT

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!
news.kei.com!das.wang.com!wang!dbushong@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <rcrw90-150993092718@node_142cf.aieg.mot.com>, <!--jzhvg@dixie.com>,
<1993Sep17.213139.22592@newsgate.sps.mot.com>

Subject : Re: Codeless Technician

Rick Aldom <ayka60@email.sps.mot.com> writes:

>In article <!--jzhvg@dixie.com> John De Armond, jgd@dixie.com writes:

> I guess the faux snobbery of many CW operators is the thing that bugs
>me the most about CW.

> I know that John tends to stir up the r.r.a.misc board, but maybe some
>of the more snobbish hams should take note.....Just because your took
>the time to learn CW doesn't make you any better or worse than anyone
>else.

How do you know that?

> I have no problem with those who want to enjoy CW as their mode of
>operation, but to assume [...] that everyone has to be proficient in
>CW to use HF is ludicrous.

I guess if people who weren't proficient in CW were confined to certain bands that wouldn't interfere with my enjoyment of the CW part of the hobby, then I wouldn't mind. But saying that anywhere is OK to operate (I know that you didn't say just that) is a lot like putting bicycles on the interstate, saying "to assume that ... everyone has to be proficient in [driving a car] to use [the interstate] is ludicrous."

Is this the same kind of thing? I'm not forcing anyone to learn code, but if I'm trying to use CW to make a contact, I would really have a problem with a wide-band signal interfering with enjoyment of the hobby, just because someone didn't want to learn code.

--

Dave Bushong, Wang Laboratories, Inc. Amateur Radio Callsign KZ10
Project Leader, Recognition products kz1o@n0ary.#noca.ca.na
Internet: dbushong@wang.com ARRL VE // W5YI VE

Date: 20 Sep 1993 18:05:41 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!
moe.ksu.ksu.edu!crcnis1.unl.edu!unlinfo2!mcduffie@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Sep14.185007.21606@cyphyn.radnet.com>,
<1993Sep18.071614.9294@indirect.com>, <john.748365714@misty>
Subject : Re: Neighborhood watch groups

john@anasazi.com (John R. Moore) writes:

>nu7i@indirect.com (Darrell Shandrow) writes:

>>The neighborhood watch is a great application of amateur radio. I don't
>>think that it is necessary to get permission from a repeater group before
>>using it on such an event. This is even if that repeater is the local
>>chat box. We must remember that amateur radio is a service first and a
>>chat box secondly or maybe evenn chatting should be as low as the third or
>>least important levels.

>As an owner of repeaters (ie, part owner of Northlink), I strongly
>disagree. ANYTIME you plan to regularly use a repeater for a net,
>you should ask permission of the owner.

>If a block watch group showed up on Northlink regularly, we would ask
>them to leave (or system is statewide). If a block watch group shows up
>on ANY repeater, they are likely to be asked to leave. The repeater wasn't
>set up for block watch. If you ask the owner AHEAD of time, he might
>agree, if it isn't incompatible with the intended use of the repeater.

>And before you flame me about the public service aspect of ham radio,
>let me remind you that there are MANY different aspects of ham radio,
>and some repeaters may exist for a very specific function (such as
>DX spotting). Furthermore, other public service/safety functions that
>you don't even know about may be going on. For example, one Northlink

>repeater was put in specifically at the request of the National Weather
>Service for skywarn. If we have a big storm going, we don't want a bunch
>of neighborhood watchers on their reporting that everything is normal!

>A repeater belongs to someone. If you want to use it for YOUR group,
>on a regular bases, ASK. It's only common courtesy.

>>I participate in a walk with my blindness organization and we don't seek
>>permission since we don't know really whether or not we'll need the use of
>>a repeater. Of course, I probably wouldn't break into a busy repeater but
>>I figure anyone who wouldn't want us to do a public service event with
>>their repeater better have a legitimate service-related reason. 73 for
>>now.

>You really don't understand private property rights, apparently.

Right on! I was about to reply in a like manner to him but you beat me
to it and were a little more civilized than I would have been (but
then, everyone knows that:))

He seems to think that every repeater is put there for people to use
how they see fit. As you said, in many cases, this isn't true. While
emergency traffic should be handled by any repeater without complaint,
the routine use, without asking the owners permission, would be
intolerable and the system would eventually be shut off if they didn't
leave when asked.

73, Gary

Date: 20 Sep 93 14:25:44 GMT
From: walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@RUTGERS.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Sep7.154112.23611@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
<1993Sep8.173138.21542@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>, <27gosk\$b4e@hobbes.cc.uga.edu>t
Subject : Re: Possession & Illegal Confiscation of Amateur Radios?

>>In article <ahLvt*-j1@ve3faq.UUCP> smc@ve3faq.UUCP (Scott McIntyre) writes:
>>>A few weeks ago, I received my registration package for the upcoming school
>>>year, and I noticed a new "rule" on the student conduct sheet. The new rule
>>>pertained to communication devices. All cellular telephones, pagers, _and
>>>two way radio devices_ were banned from being anywhere on school property,

Under such a broad and sweeping prohibition, the rule (as posted above)
would appear to also ban cellular phones, CB radios, ham radios, etc.
even if they are installed in a vehicle. Maybe they expect anyone

with a mobile phone/radio to "check it at the gate" and then pick it up on the way out :-) :-)

As this appeared some time ago, does Scott McIntyre have any update?

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

Date: 20 Sep 1993 18:12:18 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!
moe.ksu.ksu.edu!crcnis1.unl.edu!unlinfo2!mcduffie@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Sep18.071614.9294@indirect.com>, <john.748365714@misty>,
<1993Sep20.134233.12758@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>
Subject : Re: Neighborhood watch groups

lkollar@nyx.cs.du.edu (Larry Kollar) writes:

>This is probably a tempest in a teapot... it should be no problem to find
>a friendly repeater. F'r example, a friend of mine has a repeater set up
>on a Forest Service tower in north Georgia and justifies it by saying it's
>for emergency/public service use. I haven't asked him, but I'd bet he'd
>welcome a neighborhood watch group for that very reason. (The repeater
>also hosts a weekly county ARES net, but that's another topic.)

The key is "he'd welcome a neighborhood watch group". He approves the use of that (his) equipment for that purpose, at that time.

>Anyway...

>john@anasazi.com (John R. Moore) writes:

>>A repeater belongs to someone. If you want to use it for YOUR group,
>>on a regular bases, ASK. It's only common courtesy.

>This I strongly agree with. Although I munched the relevant text, I also
>agree that Northlink (& other linked repeater groups) are not the place
>for local/neighborhood exercises. However, if you're a repeater owner
>and do not want a public service group on your machine, it's only common
>courtesy (dare I say "obligation"?) to help that group find a more suitable
>(or more accommodating) repeater.

>--

>Larry Kollar, KC4WZK

I strongly disagree with the last statement. Why should I (or anyone else) be obligated to find you another repeater to use? Scout around and find it on your own...and ASK the owner if your use would rub him the wrong way (before you use it for that purpose unless it is an emergency).

73, Gary

Date: Mon, 20 Sep 1993 15:27:24 GMT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!ennews!anasaz!misty!john@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Sep18.071614.9294@indirect.com>, <john.748365714@misty>,
<1993Sep20.134233.12758@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>
Subject : Re: Neighborhood watch groups

lkollar@nyx.cs.du.edu (Larry Kollar) writes:

>This is probably a tempest in a teapot... it should be no problem to find
>a friendly repeater. F'r example, a friend of mine has a repeater set up
>on a Forest Service tower in north Georgia and justifies it by saying it's
>for emergency/public service use. I haven't asked him, but I'd bet he'd
>welcome a neighborhood watch group for that very reason. (The repeater
>also hosts a weekly county ARES net, but that's another topic.)

>Anyway...

>john@anasazi.com (John R. Moore) writes:

>>A repeater belongs to someone. If you want to use it for YOUR group,
>>on a regular bases, ASK. It's only common courtesy.

>This I strongly agree with. Although I munched the relevant text, I also
>agree that Northlink (& other linked repeater groups) are not the place
>for local/neighborhood exercises. However, if you're a repeater owner
>and do not want a public service group on your machine, it's only common
>courtesy (dare I say "obligation"?) to help that group find a more suitable
>(or more accommodating) repeater.

As I said in the part of my post you deleted, North Link, in particular,
IS used for public service - Skywarn, emergency communications at the

Grand Canyon, forest fires, etc. The first linked repeater on the system was set up to help with Hands Across America communications.

I don't think that a repeater owner should be any more required to help a group find another machine. After all, being a repeater owner doesn't give him some special insight into repeaters in general.

Furthermore, I don't think most neighborhood watch groups even need a repeater. Just how big IS a neighborhood, anyway?

--

DISCLAIMER: These views are mine alone, and do not reflect my employer's!
John Moore 7525 Clearwater Pkwy, Scottsdale, AZ 85253 USA (602-951-9326)
john@anasazi.com Amateur call:NJ7E Civil Air Patrol:Thunderbird 381
- Democracy is two wolves and a sheep using majority vote to decide what -
- to have for dinner. SUPPORT THE BILL OF RIGHTS - INCLUDING THE 2nd! -

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #343
